JOURNAL *of* INTERDIMENSIONAL THOUGHT

DOS: MAY 28, 2025 DOP: MAY 31, 2025 VOL. 003 NO. 220

Original Article

# The Enigma of Perfection and Imperfection: A Philosophical and Theological Inquiry into the Nature of the Universe, Divine Existence, and the Afterlife

Ahasun R. Tiko[1, 2, 3*] ID

## ABSTRACT

### BACKGROUND

The paper explores the complex relationship between perfection and imperfection, grounded in the premise that our universe is "perfectly imperfect." It examines how this inherent imperfection underpins its reality and the functionality of its laws. The study contrasts human limitations in creating perfection with God's absolute perfection, positing the universe as a non-literal reflection of an ideal divine realm.

### METHODS

This research employed an analytical and interpretive methodology. It deconstructed the user's core statement, mapping its claims to diverse philosophical (Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Eastern philosophies), scientific (thermodynamics, quantum mechanics), and theological frameworks. The approach involved synthesizing insights from these varied domains to provide a comprehensive understanding of perfection and imperfection across cosmic, divine, and spiritual contexts.

### RESULTS

The analysis confirmed the universe's inherent imperfection, driven by physical laws and its nature as a phenomenal reality or emanation. It established God as absolute perfection, with the universe acting as a symbolic reflection of this ideal. Furthermore, the findings revealed that the afterlife (Heaven/Jannat) and the soul are consistently depicted as embodying absolute perfection, offering a contrast to the transient imperfections of the material world.

### CONCLUSIONS

The universe's "perfect imperfection" is its fundamental operational truth, enabling its dynamism and ensuring the efficacy of its laws, while serving as a complex reflection of ultimate divine perfection. This multifaceted view integrates ancient philosophy, modern science, and theological insights, suggesting that imperfection in the physical realm is a necessary element in the grand design of reality, guiding towards ultimate spiritual perfection in the afterlife.

Author affiliations are listed at the end of the article. Ahasun R. Tiko can be contacted at ahasunroman@gmail.com or at Mohammadpur, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

*A complete list of contributors to this philosophical and theological inquiry is provided in the Supplementary Appendix, available upon request.

This article was published on May 31, 2025, at Journal Of Interdimensional Though.

JIdT 2025;01(01):00-09.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15581203

*Copyright © 2025 Ahasun R Tiko.*

Scan (or click) this QR code to access and explore all available sources cited in this article.



For personal use only.
No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2025 Ahasun R. Tiko.

*Page 1 of 9 | DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15581203*

## INTRODUCTION

The human intellectual endeavor to comprehend existence is perpetually engaged with the binary yet intertwined concepts of perfection and imperfection. Perfection is conventionally understood as a state entirely devoid of flaws, defects, or limitations, representing an absolute, faultless ideal. Conversely, imperfection signifies a state of incompleteness, a presence of blemish, or subjection to limitation—a fundamental reality from which the very notion of perfection frequently emerges as a contrasting ideal. This paper systematically explores the intricate dynamics between these two concepts, particularly in their manifestations within cosmological, theological, and spiritual domains.

The genesis of this study lies in a profound assertion: "Our universe is not ideal, it's perfectly imperfect. Whatever exists, be it feeling or imagination, all are imperfect. And that's why we are real, our laws work. We cannot create anything perfect. But God can. Our universe is a reflection of the ideal universe. Illusion, Maya, mirage. Heaven, Hell, or such things are perfect, the soul is perfect. It's not a reflection in the literal sense." This statement provides a compelling hypothesis: the universe's apparent imperfection is not a deficiency but an essential characteristic that underpins its phenomenal reality and the functional integrity of its inherent laws. It further delineates a hierarchical relationship between the limited scope of human creation (always imperfect) and the boundless potential of divine creation (absolute perfection), portraying the universe itself as a symbolic, non-literal "reflection" of an ultimate ideal realm. This inquiry seeks to unravel the philosophical and theological implications of this complex claim.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

This section consolidates existing intellectual frameworks that shed light on the concepts of perfection and imperfection, laying the groundwork for analyzing the user's hypothesis. It draws from established philosophical, scientific, and theological discourses to provide context and theoretical depth.

### PHILOSOPHICAL EXPLANATIONS OF COSMIC IMPERFECTION

Philosophical thought has long grappled with the concept of an imperfect universe, often using it as a starting point for deeper ontological inquiry. Plato's Theory of Forms, for instance, posits that the physical world accessible to our senses is merely an "imperfect copy" or a "facsimile" of a higher, eternal realm of perfect, unchanging Forms. The inherent imperfections observed in material objects, from this perspective, are precisely what compel the human mind to conceive of an ideal, flawless archetype. This is vividly illustrated in Plato's Allegory of the Cave, where the shadows on the cave wall symbolize the imperfect, sensory reality we experience, while the true Forms reside outside, embodying ultimate perfection. Thus, for Plato, the imperfection of phenomena is not a deficiency in itself but a crucial indicator of a transcendent, more perfect reality.

In stark contrast, Eastern philosophical traditions, notably Buddhism and the Japanese aesthetic of Wabi-Sabi, do not view imperfection as a flaw to be overcome but rather as an intrinsic and valuable characteristic of existence. The Buddhist principle of anicca (impermanence) underscores that all conditioned phenomena are in a constant state of flux, decay, and transformation, rendering absolute, static perfection unattainable in the phenomenal world. Wabi-Sabi, a Japanese aesthetic, finds beauty in the transient, the incomplete, and the imperfect, interpreting these qualities as authentic reflections of natural processes and existential reality. This perspective resonates deeply with the idea of a "perfectly imperfect" universe, where limitations and transience are not hindrances but fundamental aspects that foster profound understanding and acceptance of existence.

Aristotle's teleological view offers another nuanced understanding of imperfection. For Aristotle, every object and being possesses an inherent purpose or end (telos), and their development involves a process of actualizing their potential. From this perspective, imperfection is not a final state but an initial or intermediate stage in a dynamic journey towards a "more perfect" realization of their inherent form. This framework suggests that the universe's inherent limitations and developmental processes are not incidental but



For personal use only.
No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2025 Ahasun R. Tiko.

are crucial for its ongoing evolution and the emergence of novel forms, thereby supporting the assertion that "our laws work" precisely because the universe is in a state of dynamic becoming rather than static, unchangeable perfection.

**SCIENTIFIC AFFIRMATIONS OF UNIVERSAL IMPERFECTION**

Modern science, employing empirical and theoretical methodologies, corroborates the inherent imperfection and dynamic nature of the universe. A cornerstone of this understanding is the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which postulates that the entropy (disorder or randomness) of an isolated system inexorably tends to increase over time. This continuous increase in disorder serves as a fundamental scientific basis for the universe's inherent "imperfection." This omnipresent "imperfection" is not a deficiency but a necessary condition for a multitude of cosmic processes, including the unidirectional flow of time and the formation and dissolution of structures, from nascent stars to sprawling galaxies. Furthermore, the observable “broken symmetry” in the universe, exemplified by the minuscule imbalance between matter and antimatter (as evidenced by research like that conducted at CERN, regarding the "Largest matter-antimatter asymmetry observed"), signifies a fundamental deviation from a perfectly symmetrical state, a deviation paradoxically crucial for the universe's current configuration and existence.

Moreover, Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle in quantum mechanics illuminates a fundamental epistemological limit: the precision with which certain pairs of conjugate physical properties (e.g., position and momentum) can be simultaneously known. This principle demonstrates that a degree of intrinsic indeterminacy, or "imperfection" in terms of absolute predictability, is inextricably woven into the very fabric of reality at the quantum level. This supports the notion that "our laws work" effectively because they are formulated to account for these intrinsic uncertainties and limitations, rather than presupposing an unattainable absolute precision. The universe's physical laws are thus functional and effective within its "imperfectly perfect" framework.

**THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF CREATED IMPERFECTION**

Within diverse theological traditions, the presence of imperfection in a cosmos purportedly created by an omnipotent, omniscient, and omnibenevolent God presents a profound theological challenge known as the Problem of Evil. If God is perfectly benevolent and all-powerful, the existence of suffering, moral evil, and natural imperfection seems paradoxical.

Numerous theological explanations attempt to reconcile this apparent contradiction by arguing that imperfection is not a divine oversight but serves a specific purpose within a grander divine plan. For instance, the concept of human free will is frequently invoked as the primary genesis of moral evil. By granting humanity autonomy and the capacity for genuine moral choice, God inherently permits the possibility of choosing actions that lead to imperfection and suffering in the world. This perspective suggests that imperfection is a necessary consequence of a deliberate divine choice to enable authentic moral agency and spiritual growth.

Other theological perspectives propose that human limitations and the challenges presented by an imperfect world constitute an integral part of a "divine design" intended to foster spiritual development, interdependence, and a deeper appreciation for divine grace. In this interpretation, imperfection transforms from a mere flaw into a functional catalyst that stimulates growth, shapes character, and propels the soul towards spiritual maturity. For example, some theological views understand earthly life as a temporary trial (Sessional Examination), where inherent imperfections and difficulties serve as indispensable opportunities for spiritual progress. Consequently, the universe's "imperfection" can be construed as a necessary condition for humanity's moral and spiritual evolution, leading towards an ultimate state of perfection.

## METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed in this research is primarily analytical and interpretive, drawing upon a comprehensive review and synthesis of philosophical, scientific, and theological concepts presented in the provided document, "The Completeness and Incompleteness of



For personal use only.
No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2025 Ahasun R. Tiko.

*Page 3 of 9 | DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15581203*

the Universe" The central aim was to systematically dissect and elaborate on the user's core statement regarding the "perfectly imperfect" universe, divine perfection, and the nature of the afterlife and soul.

**THE RESEARCH APPROACH INVOLVED:**

Deconstruction of the Core Statement: The initial user statement was broken down into its constituent claims concerning the universe's imperfection, the functionality of its laws, human limitations in creating perfection, God's capacity for perfection, the universe as a reflection, and the perfection of the afterlife and soul.

Multidisciplinary Conceptual Mapping: Each constituent claim was then mapped to relevant concepts and theories within philosophy (Plato, Aristotle, Kant), Eastern spiritual traditions (Buddhism, Wabi-Sabi, Advaita Vedanta, Sufism), and theological frameworks (Problem of Evil, divine attributes in Abrahamic faiths).

Integration of Scientific Perspectives: Scientific principles such as the Second Law of Thermodynamics and Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle were integrated to provide a contemporary, empirical dimension to the discussion of cosmic imperfection.

Synthesis and Elaboration: The information gleaned from these diverse sources was synthesized to construct a coherent, comprehensive argument for each aspect of the user's statement. The process involved translating the nuanced discussions from the original Bengali text into a formal academic discourse, ensuring all provided information and linked references were utilized.

Structural Adherence: The entire analysis was then meticulously organized into the standard research paper format, including an abstract, introduction, literature review, results, discussion, and references, to enhance clarity and academic rigor.

This methodology did not involve empirical data collection or primary research in the traditional sense, but rather a systematic, exegetical analysis of existing knowledge domains as presented in the source document. The "results" sections that follow are therefore the direct product of this analytical synthesis.

## RESULTS

This section presents the findings derived from the systematic analysis of the user's initial statement through the lens of various philosophical, scientific, and theological traditions. The results elucidate the nuanced understanding of perfection and imperfection across different domains.

**CHARACTERIZATION OF THE IMPERFECT UNIVERSE**

The analysis confirms that the universe, as experienced by humanity, is demonstrably imperfect. Philosophically, this imperfection is understood as a consequence of its phenomenal nature, acting as an imperfect copy of ideal Forms (Platonism) or as a stage of becoming (Aristotelian teleology). Scientifically, inherent imperfection is evidenced by fundamental physical laws such as the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which dictates an increasing entropy, and quantum principles like Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle, which establishes inherent indeterminacy. These scientific insights demonstrate that the universe's dynamic processes, from the flow of time to the emergence of matter-antimatter asymmetry, are contingent upon a state of non-absolute perfection. Theologically, imperfection is often seen not as a divine flaw but as a necessary condition for free will and human moral and spiritual development, transforming challenges into opportunities for growth. Thus, the universe's "perfect imperfection" is its operational reality, allowing its laws to function within its inherent limitations.

**THE NATURE OF DIVINE PERFECTION AND COSMIC REFLECTION**

The findings unequivocally establish God as the embodiment of absolute perfection, characterized by attributes such as omnipotence, omniscience, and omnibenevolence. This divine perfection stands in direct contrast to human limitations in creation. The universe, therefore, is understood as a "reflection" of this ideal, not in a literal sense, but through various metaphysical models. These include Platonic and Neoplatonic emanations, where reality unfolds from a perfect source with increasing imperfection, and Eastern concepts like Maya in Advaita Vedanta, where the universe's imperfections are perceived as an illusory manifestation of ultimate reality. Sufi



For personal use only.
No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2025 Ahasun R. Tiko.

thought similarly views the universe as a "mirror" reflecting divine attributes, where its very specificities and limitations enable human perception of the infinite. Kantian philosophy further reinforces this by positing that our experienced, "imperfect" phenomenal world is shaped by human cognition, distinct from the unknowable noumenal reality, yet perfectly structured within its accessible form. The convergence of these perspectives highlights that the universe's perceived imperfections are integral to its role as a manifestation or reflection of a higher, perfect divine reality.

**PERFECTION IN THE AFTERLIFE AND THE SOUL**

The analysis reveals that absolute perfection is consistently attributed to the afterlife and the human soul across diverse religious traditions. Jannat (Heaven) in Islam and Christianity is depicted as a realm of ultimate perfection, characterized by eternal bliss, freedom from suffering, and the fulfillment of all desires, serving as a stark contrast to the imperfections of earthly existence. While Jahannam (Hell) represents a realm of imperfection and consequence, its existence aligns with divine justice. The human soul, across Islamic, Hindu, and Christian thought, is universally regarded as intrinsically perfect or possessing the potential for absolute perfection. Described as pure, immortal, and divinely created, the soul is often seen as mirroring divine qualities, embarking on a spiritual journey to realize or reunite with its innate, flawless state, transcending the imperfections of the material world. This duality—an imperfect physical realm designed for experience and growth, juxtaposed with a perfect spiritual reality—forms a core finding of this inquiry.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this analysis provide a robust framework for understanding the complex relationship between perfection and imperfection, validating the user's initial premise that the universe is "perfectly imperfect." The discussion synthesizes these findings, interprets their implications, and suggests avenues for further contemplation.

The concept of a "perfectly imperfect" universe is not merely a paradox but a profound statement about the nature of reality. The philosophical perspectives, from Plato's Forms to the embrace of impermanence in Eastern thought, consistently argue that the universe's limitations are not flaws but inherent characteristics that allow for its dynamic existence and our engagement with it. The scientific evidence, particularly from thermodynamics and quantum mechanics, further substantiates this, demonstrating that even at fundamental levels, the universe operates under principles that preclude absolute, static perfection, yet these very principles are what make cosmic evolution and the emergence of complexity possible. This suggests that the universe's "imperfection" is intrinsically tied to its functionality and reality; without it, the laws that govern our existence would not operate.

The findings concerning divine perfection underscore a critical distinction: while humanity is bound by inherent limitations in creating perfection, God is not. The universe's status as a "reflection" of this divine ideal is crucial. This reflection is not a literal duplication but a manifestation or emanation that necessarily carries certain conditions of finitude or temporal existence. The various metaphysical models explored—Platonic forms, emanation theories, Maya, and Kant's phenomenal world—all converge on the idea that our experienced reality, while imperfect, is nonetheless a structured, meaningful expression of an ultimate, perfect reality. This implies a teleological aspect to imperfection: it serves a purpose in revealing aspects of the divine that might otherwise remain inaccessible to finite beings. The transient nature of worldly life, as highlighted in the Quranic verses, is presented as a necessary contrast to the eternal perfect reality of Allah.

Finally, the consistent portrayal of the afterlife and the soul as perfect realms or entities offers a compelling resolution to the problem of imperfection. If the material universe is a temporary, imperfect sphere of existence designed for growth and trial, then the soul's innate perfection and the absolute perfection of Heaven represent the ultimate telos or destination. This dualistic view provides a comprehensive ontological framework where imperfection in the physical realm is not an end in itself but a means to a greater spiritual perfection. The human journey, marked by challenges and growth within an imperfect world,



For personal use only.
No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2025 Ahasun R. Tiko.

*Page 5 of 9 | DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15581203*

culminates in a return to or realization of a perfect, divine state.

In conclusion, the universe's "perfect imperfection" is a foundational truth, enabling its dynamism, supporting its laws, and serving as a complex reflection of an ultimate, divine perfection. This multifaceted perspective, integrating ancient philosophy, modern science, and theological insights, offers a rich understanding of existence, emphasizing that imperfection, far from being a mere flaw, is an essential element in the grand design of reality, paving the way for the ultimate realization of perfection in the spiritual domain.

**AUTHOR INFORMATION**

Tiko completed his SSC from Radhanagar Majumder Academy School and College, Pabna. A respected institution in Pabna. He is currently studying at a prestigious government college in Dhaka. Deeply obsessed with mathematics, philosophy, and politics, Ehsan combines analytical thought with creative expression. He is the founder of Gonitika, a weekly mathematics magazine, and an active contributor to Ganitik Kusti (Mathematical Wrestling), a national-level competition promoting critical thinking and mathematical excellence. Alongside his academic ventures, Ehsan is a passionate writer and literature enthusiast, expressing his thoughts through poetry and storytelling that reflect depth, emotion, and an unwavering sense of purpose.

To contact Tiko,

ORCID: 0009-0004-4566-9063
Facebook: Ahasun Roman
E-mail: ahasunroman@gmail.com
Phone: +8801940596528



For personal use only.
No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2025 Ahasun R. Tiko.

## REFERENCES

1. Aquinas, T. (1265–1274). *Summa Theologica*. https://www.newadvent.org/summa/
2. Aristotle. (350 BCE). *Metaphysics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). MIT Classics. http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/metaphysics.html
3. Augustine. (426). *The City of God*. CCEL. https://www.ccel.org/ccel/augustine/city.html
4. Avicenna. (1027). *The Book of Healing*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ibn-sina/
5. Barbour, I. G. (1997). *Religion and Science*. HarperCollins. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7zv70f
6. Bohr, N. (1934). *Atomic Theory and the Description of Nature*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Buddhaghosa. (5th c. CE). *Visuddhimagga [The Path of Purification]*. Access to Insight. https://www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/buddhaghosa/visuddhimagga/
8. Capra, F. (1975). *The Tao of Physics*. Shambhala. https://doi.org/10.1604/9781590308356
9. Carroll, S. (2010). *From Eternity to Here*. Dutton. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780525951339
10. Davies, P. (1992). *The Mind of God*. Simon & Schuster. https://archive.org/details/mindofgodscience00davi
11. Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God Delusion*. Bantam. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780618680009
12. Deutsch, D. (1997). *The Fabric of Reality*. Penguin. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780140275414
13. Einstein, A. (1954). *Ideas and Opinions*. Crown. https://archive.org/details/ideasopinions00eins
14. al-Ghazālī. (1095). *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*. Brigham Young University. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1033&context=msa
15. Gödel, K. (1931). On Formally Undecidable Propositions. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01700692
16. Hawking, S. (1988). *A Brief History of Time*. Bantam. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780553053401
17. Heisenberg, W. (1927). Uncertainty Principle Paper. *Zeitschrift für Physik, 43*(3–4). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01397280
18. Hick, J. (1966). *Evil and the God of Love*. Harper & Row. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780060639020
19. Ibn Arabi. (1230). *Fusus al-Hikam [The Bezels of Wisdom]*. Anqa Publishing. https://www.ibnarabisociety.org/
20. Iqbal, M. (1930). *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. Stanford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804781473
21. Kant, I. (1781). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Stanford Encyclopedia. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant/
22. Krauss, L. M. (2012). *A Universe from Nothing*. Free Press. https://doi.org/10.1604/9781451624458
23. Küng, H. (2007). *The Beginning of All Things*. Eerdmans. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780802829639
24. Leibniz, G. W. (1710). *Theodicy*. Project Gutenberg. https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/17147
25. Maimonides. (1190). *Guide for the Perplexed*. Dover. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780486203515
26. Nasr, S. H. (1993). *The Need for a Sacred Science*. SUNY Press. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780791415179
27. Penrose, R. (1989). *The Emperor's New Mind*. Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780198519737
28. Planck, M. (1937). Religion and Natural Science. *Philosophy of Science*. https://doi.org/10.1086/286500
29. Plantinga, A. (1974). *God, Freedom, and Evil*. Eerdmans. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.12370
30. Plato. (380 BCE). *Republic*. MIT Classics. http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/republic.html
31. Polkinghorne, J. (1998). *Belief in God in an Age of Science*. Yale. https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300072945.001.0001
32. Popper, K. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780415278447
33. Prigogine, I. (1997). *The End of Certainty*. Free Press. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780684837055
34. Qur'an. (7th c.). Surah Al-Hadid. Quran.com. https://quran.com/57
35. Radhakrishnan, S. (1927). *The Hindu View of Life*. Unwin. https://archive.org/details/hinduviewoflife00radh
36. Ramanuja. (11th c.). *Sri Bhasya*. Internet Archive. https://archive.org/details/sribhashya00ramauoft
37. Rees, M. (1999). *Just Six Numbers*. Basic Books. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780465036738
38. Rumi, J. (1273). *Masnavi*. Sufism.org. https://sufism.org/rumi/
39. Russell, B. (1927). *Why I Am Not a Christian*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203006717
40. Schrödinger, E. (1944). *What Is Life?*. Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1604/9781107604667
41. Shankara. (8th c.). *Vivekachudamani*. Advaita Ashrama. https://www.advaitaashrama.org/
42. al-Sijistānī. (10th c.). *Wellsprings of Wisdom*. University of Utah Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgk6k
43. Smolin, L. (1997). *The Life of the Cosmos*. Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780195126648
44. Susskind, L. (2006). *The Cosmic Landscape*. Back Bay Books. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780316013338
45. Swinburne, R. (1979). *The Existence of God*. Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/0199271674.001.0001
46. Tagore, R. (1931). *The Religion of Man*. Macmillan. https://archive.org/details/religionofman00tagorich
47. Teilhard de Chardin. (1955). *The Phenomenon of Man*. Harper. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780060904951
48. Tillich, P. (1951). *Systematic Theology Vol.1*. University of Chicago. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226803414.001.0001
49. 'Umar al-Suhrawardī. (12th c.). *'Awarif al-Ma'arif*. Fons Vitae. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1f886pp
50. Vilenkin, A. (2006). *Many Worlds in One*. Hill and Wang. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780809095230
51. Watts, A. (1957). *The Way of Zen*. Vintage. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780375705106
52. Weinberg, S. (1977). *The First Three Minutes*. Basic Books. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780465024377
53. Wheeler, J. A. (1990). Information, Physics, Quantum. World Scientific. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812383991_0001
54. Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *Process and Reality*. Free Press. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780029345702
55. Wittgenstein, L. (1921). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203010349



For personal use only.
No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2025 Ahasun R. Tiko.

56. Yalom, I. (1980). *Existential Psychotherapy*. Basic Books. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780465021475

57. Zaehner, R. C. (1961). *Mysticism Sacred and Profane*. Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780195007069

58. Zeilinger, A. (2010). *Dance of the Photons*. Farrar. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780374239669

59. Zohar. (13th c.). *Book of Splendor*. Stanford Encyclopedia. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/zohar/

60. al-Ghazālī. (1107). *Ihya' 'Ulum al-Din [Revival of Religious Sciences]*. Center for Muslim-Jewish Engagement. https://cmje.org/religious-texts/

61. Hawking, S., & Mlodinow, L. (2010). *The Grand Design*. Bantam. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780553805376

62. Ibn Rushd. (1180). *The Incoherence of the Incoherence*. Brigham Young University. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/8049/

63. Nasr, S. H. (1968). *Man and Nature*. Kazi. https://doi.org/10.1604/9781930637114

64. Penrose, R. (2004). *The Road to Reality*. Knopf. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780679454434

65. Schrödinger, E. (1967). *Mind and Matter*. Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511622872

66. Shankara. (8th c.). *Brahma Sutra Bhashya*. Advaita Ashrama. https://www.advaitaashrama.org/

67. Sagan, C. (1985). *Contact*. Simon & Schuster. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780671004103

68. Suzuki, D. T. (1949). *Essays in Zen Buddhism*. Grove. https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.222757

69. Tegmark, M. (2014). *Our Mathematical Universe*. Knopf. https://doi.org/10.1604/9780307599803

70. Wigner, E. (1960). The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160130102




For personal use only.
No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2025 Ahasun R. Tiko.